

Danielson, Thomas J

From: Paul Morin [ssdp@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 7:32 AM
To: Danielson, Thomas J
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Green

Dear Mr. Danielson;

This is not the first time I respond to this situation involving phosphorus removal. Here in Sabattus the traditional biological treatment we have was not designed to remove phosphorus down to levels that the state is putting forth. we are a small district with and not part of the town involvement and NOT part of the tax money. NO general fund to dip into. We are USER system with nearly 40 pump stations and all the expenses that go along with wages, insurances, permits, lab costs,etc... I could go on and on. I started here 20 years ago with basic ph, settleable solids, solids testing, B.O.D.'s . Now it has come to WET testing, lead, copper, cadmium, Pollutant Priority testing, ammonia, Mercury which has added substantial costs to our overall operations. As pointed out before and is well documented that the Sabattus Pond upstream from us IS the problem with high amounts of phosphorus coming from storm, farm runoff, septic systems around the pond and not our small amounts of nutrients that is the problem.Adding nutrient removal would add SIGNIFICANT cost to our rate payers. we have more than we can handle with our pump station upgrades and day to day operations without the added costs of this nutrient removal. Again I am in this industry to promote clean water, but the source of our nutrients IS IN THE POND and no with our extended aeration package plant, here at the district. I would like a receipt of this letter to make sure this is heard and posted in the comments.